

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are previously canceled. Claims 16, 19, 21, 28, 29, and 30 are amended herein. Claim 24 has been canceled. No new claims have been added and accordingly, claims 16-23, and 25-30 remain under prosecution in this application.

Claim Objections

Claim 26 is objected to because the abbreviation “(EDS)” should be corrected to “(ESP)”. The undersigned has made the appropriate correction and accordingly, this claim objection is overcome.

35 USC §112, second paragraph

Claims 19, 24 and 30 are rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. The Examiner set forth numerous instances of indefiniteness with these three claims. The undersigned has carefully considered the Examiner’s rejection and suggested amendments and each one of the claims has been amended appropriately to overcome the Examiner’s indefiniteness rejection. Claim 24 has been canceled.

35 USC §103

Claims 16-21, and 24-28 are rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Janssen et al in view of Monzaki. Claim 16 has been amended to incorporate the step wherein “detecting and evaluating the vibration behavior of individual vehicle wheels, **wherein said detecting and evaluating step is directed solely to driven wheels.** . .” None of the references of record teach or suggest evaluating the vibration behavior of individual vehicle wheels by solely using the **driven wheels**. The Examiner states that “Janssen teaches a method for controlling a vehicle including the steps of detecting and evaluating the vibration behavior of the individual wheels on the driven axle (page 3, lines 12-19)”. However, close evaluation of this portion of Janssen does not specifically teach solely using the driven wheels for detecting and evaluating the vibration behavior of individual vehicle wheels. The Examiner’s attention is directed to page 3, lines 12-19 wherein the need to “recognize wheel vibration or drive train vibrations” is mentioned but nowhere is it stated what means is used to recognize those

vibrations. Support is found in paragraph 7 of the substitute specification, clean copy, for the amendments made to claim 16.

Claim 19 also builds upon the concept of using only the driven wheels to determine the vibration behavior of individual vehicle wheels. None of the references teach monitoring the period of vibration on at least two driven wheels to determine if the period of vibration falls within a specified range. For this reason, claim 19 stands alone as also being allowable over the art of record.

Claims 28 and 29 have been amended to both incorporate the feature of "detecting and evaluating the vibration behavior of individual vehicle wheels, wherein said detecting and evaluating step is directed solely to driven wheels. . ." For the same reasons mentioned above, this feature, now added to claims 28 and 29 makes them distinguishable over the art of record.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-0013, under Order No. 64098-0901 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: January 7, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Joseph V. Coppola, Sr.

Registration No.: 33,373

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

39533 Woodward Avenue

Suite 140

Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48304

(248) 594-0650

Attorney for Applicant